DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 170 HE 024 282

AUTHOR Rabitoy, Neil
TITLE Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum. Academic Challenges.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Long Beach. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 28p.
AVAILABLE FROM Academic Program Improvement, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, 400 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802-4275.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Education; *Curriculum Development; Ethnic Studies; Higher Education; Program Evaluation; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS *California State University

ABSTRACT

This booklet evaluates 13 cross-cultural education projects that were initiated at California State University campuses. The projects all strived to incorporate into the curriculum and educational environment more scholarship on ethnic studies and a greater sensitivity to the values and needs of minority cultural groups. Among the findings of the evaluation were the following: (1) the kind of curricular reform required in order to establish a cross-cultural emphasis in the college curriculum requires substantial time to implement; (2) projects of this type require strong yet sensitive leadership and genuine administrative support; (3) the most effective curricular reform was that aimed specifically at the disciplines as opposed to introducing reform into the entire university curriculum; and (4) to be truly effective, curricular reform efforts must meet the needs of the faculty, and the faculty must be given the tools with which to implement changes. Contains 5 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329170

Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Academic Program Improvement, CA State University

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE024282

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACADEMIC PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Text by Neil Rabitoy, Professor of History
California State University, Los Angeles

Edited by Carol Holder, Professor of English
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Graphics by Marguerite Wobschall

Funded by Academic Program Improvement
CSU Office of the Chancellor

Helen Roberts, State University Dean
Instructional Improvement

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
List of API Projects	3
Background	4
Summary of Projects	7
Evaluation	12
Conclusions/Observations	18

Introduction

The Civil Rights Movement in the United States resulted in, among many other things, a much greater awareness among Americans that theirs was a culturally pluralistic society. This awareness led some to question whether their social, economic, and political institutions were designed to serve such a society. Many concluded, in the case of the educational system, that the curriculum at all levels, including higher education, did not, in any significant way, address this reality. As the United States Commission on Civil Rights observed in 1972, a curriculum shapes the culture and values of the students exposed to it, yet the traditional curriculum in the United States was not designed to prepare students for existence in a multicultural society.

Education in this country, in other words, was out of touch with a changing national self-image and with the reality of living in the United States.

During the 1970s extensive research was conducted on the question of how education should be reformed in order to more effectively serve the needs of students. By about 1980 the thrust of this scholarship had resulted in the widespread belief that a knowledge of the ethnic complexity within the United States would be valuable for all students since they all, not just those who belong to minority ethnic groups, need to be able to function within a society composed of a number of cultural groups. There was general recognition that the curriculum was too focused on the Western experience and was too Anglo- and andro-centric. However, there was no agreement on the extent to which it needed reform and how such reform should take place.

Between 1981 and 1988, the office of Academic Program Improvement (API) of the California State University (CSU) funded, as part of its annual competitive grants program, which had begun in 1972, a series of campus projects designed to introduce cross-cultural issues and perspectives into the campus curriculum. Two projects were funded in 1981 when API identified "Cross-Cultural Studies" as a specific funding category. One of these projects appeared to be so well designed and so appropriate that between 1983 and 1987 API sought proposals from other CSU campuses who wished to replicate its activities. In all, API provided over $334,000, primarily in the form of faculty assigned time and operating expenses, for thirteen cross-cultural education projects

conducted on twelve campuses. In addition, each campus contributed substantial supplemental funds. Most of the projects were conducted over a single academic year, though three were two-year projects and one was funded for three years.

The projects shared common goals. They sought, through the incorporation into the curriculum of the new scholarship on ethnic studies, to create an educational environment which would be more sensitive to the values and needs of minority cultural groups and to create a curriculum which would better serve the needs of all students. And since faculty cooperation is a prerequisite for successful curricular change on any campus, each project endeavored to increase faculty awareness of the need to create a curriculum which addressed the reality of cultural pluralism.

In all, API provided over $334,000, primarily in the form of faculty assigned time and operating expenses, for thirteen cross-cultural education projects conducted on twelve campuses.

The impact of these projects varied. Some were successfully implemented and resulted in demonstrable curricular change; a few encountered difficulties during the project year and had only a slight impact on the campus; the majority fell somewhere in between. In all, over 400 faculty participated in the projects and thousands of students have benefited from the resulting changes in curricular content. If they did not always result in dramatic changes in course content, these projects were, nonetheless, an important part of the process whereby the CSU began to address the challenge of reforming the curriculum so that it would better meet the requirements of a multicultural society.

API PROJECTS:
CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES IN THE CURRICULUM

Director	Campus	Grant	Year(s)	Project Title
Deborah Rosenfelt	San Francisco	$53,564	1981, 82	Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum
Irene McKenna	Dominguez Hills	$10,404	1981	Faculty Hispanic Study Program
Ann Peters	Dominguez Hills	$12,766	1983	Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum
Alex Yamato	Humboldt	$11,888	1983	Cross-Cultural Perspectives: Replication and Extension
Carol Mukhopadhyay/ Hilda Hernandez	Chico	$40,375	1983, 84	Mainstreaming Cross-Cultural Perspectives in Teacher Training
Sandra Sutphen	Fullerton	$17,993	1984	Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum — A Replication
Liucija Baskauskas	Northridge	$20,010	1984	Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum
Gale Auletta/ Michael Clark/ Barbara Paige-Pointer	Hayward	$50,772	1984-87	Mainstreaming Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum
Sue Parker	Sonoma	$20,000	1984	Integrating Cross-Cultural and Multicultural Perspectives into the General Education Curriculum in the Humanities and Social Sciences
Elliott Barkan	San Bernardino	$23,073	1985	Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum
S. Middleton-Keim	Stanislaus	$40,487	1986, 87	Cross-Cultural Perspectives and the "Invisible People"
Allison Heisch	San Jose	$20,782	1986	Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum: A Training Module for General Education
Sheila McCoy	Pomona	$20,060	1987	Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the G.E. and Baccalaureate Preparation of Teachers

Background

The educational curriculum in the United States has historically been a reflection of the values of those who have controlled the nation's political, economic, and social institutions. Thus, until about 1960 the curriculum at all levels was andro-centric and focused on the institutions, history, and culture of citizens of Anglo descent. Those with the power to shape the curriculum justified this focus as of particular importance for the United States since the country was in the seemingly constant process of receiving immigrants from throughout the world. Each new wave of immigrants threatened the fundamental idea that this was a country whose culture was, and would remain, White and basically Anglo-Saxon.

This was the dominant point of view. Cultural unity was regarded as a strength — almost a prerequisite for the existence of a national identity and the viability of the nation-state — yet it was challenged by the arrival of each new immigrant culture. Because of this pattern in its history, the United States has been engaged in the virtually continuous process of defining and defending its national identity. Each immigrant group was expected to become "Americanized" as quickly as possible which meant shedding the attributes and values of their culture and becoming part of the White, Anglo-Saxon culture.

The dominant societal goal was assimilation, and to a significant degree it was achieved. White immigrant groups — the Irish, Italians, Eastern Europeans, etc. — were to a great extent able to accommodate themselves in varying ways to the dominant culture and to move sporadically up the social, political, and economic ladders. But non-White ethnic groups were generally viewed as non-assimilable and there was strong resistance, as seen in the various immigration acts, to permitting them to enter the country. Similarly, African Americans and Native Americans were systematically deprived of opportunities that would give them significant power within the nation-state. These people lived in the United States and were part of the social order, but were not encouraged to aspire to participation in what came to be called "the American Dream."

Education reinforced the dominant goal of assimilation and cultural unity. A stronger nation and a stronger national identity required that students learn European history and understand the institutions, values,

and traditions that had been passed down through western civilization, most particularly the English experience. Education was seen as a vehicle for "Americanization," i.e., the creation of the "melting pot" and the fusion of all participating groups into a single culture.

This view was not seriously challenged until the late 1950s. That it was challenged at this point was in fact a function of its very failure: assimilation had failed non-White ethnic groups, and the result was the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and '60s.

As suggested above, a by-product of this movement was the general realization that the United States contains not just a single culture but is composed of many, and that some form of adjustment within institutions is necessary to reflect this cultural complexity. There followed from this realization a reform movement in education.

Initially, this reform resulted in mono-ethnic courses, i.e., courses focused on a single culture and attended and taught primarily by members of that group. In higher education this reform often resulted in the creation of ethnic studies departments which all too often had little impact on the traditional curricula offered in other academic departments. Such programs became common in the 1960s and were regarded by their proponents as an alternative and a corrective to the biases long inherent in the curricula of older academic disciplines. On the other hand, it was widely believed that these programs fostered ethnic ethnocentrism, and, since they were required to compete for funds with the other academic departments and were frequently neither welcomed nor respected by faculty in other disciplines, their existence and activities often led to academic power struggles.

As a number of ethnic groups demanding curricular coverage grew, universities began to respond by developing multi-ethnic courses which used a comparative approach. These courses were more global and conceptual in their coverage and were usually offered in the belief that a knowledge of the variety of ethnic experiences would be valuable for all students, not simply for members of a specific ethnic culture. The assumption was that all ethnic groups, though different in the specifics of their cultures, also share many common values and experiences and that an appreciation of both cultural similarities and differences would broaden the perspectives of students. The motivation was essentially "compensatory" — the attitude that fairness demands that the experience of ethnic minorities be included in the curriculum. Gradually, in many departments, many faculty started looking for ways to include the culture and experience of ethnic groups in traditional courses — in history, literature, political science, and other disciplines.

As the above idea took hold during the 1970s, the number of ethnic studies departments declined as did enrollment in those which remained. At the same time, educators also appreciated that the introduction of a few optional courses into the curriculum or the creation of ethnic studies departments was not sufficient to improve the retention and graduation rates of underrepresented minority groups or to enable the members of such groups to succeed at a level comparable to Anglo-Americans. A more profound change was necessary, both in the campus environment and student support services and in the curriculum. In addition, some began to argue that curricular reform should not just involve the insertion of ethnic issues into the curriculum, but that the cultures and experiences of groups such as women, the handicapped, and regional groups should also be included. Proponents of this multicultural approach contended that students who would be systematically exposed to the richness of the cultural experience in the United States and to the contributions of each cultural group would be better able to function in a culturally complex society. The phrase used to describe this goal was "cross-cultural competency."[1]

In many departments, many faculty started looking for ways to include the culture and experience of ethnic groups in traditional courses — in history, literature, political science, and other disciplines.

In this way, rather simply presented, educational institutions in this country were adjusting to first mono-ethnic, then multi-ethnic, and finally multi- and cross-cultural curricular reform movements.

Higher education in California, and the California State University in particular, responded to the need for a curriculum which would reflect the cultural variety within the United States. In November 1980, the CSU issued an Executive Order which required a review of all General Education programs within the system and set guidelines for their revision. These included the requirement that these programs address the issue of cultural diversity. In 1984 the California Assembly passed Assembly Resolution No. 83 which called for the creation and implementation of a plan for educational equity in the state's educational system. Equal educational opportunities, the resolution noted, would "help enhance the education of all students and prepare them for life in a culturally and linguistically pluralistic society."[2]

The Office of Academic Program Improvement recognized the issue as one of importance to the CSU and in 1981 began to solicit grant proposals specifically for experimental projects in multicultural education from all campuses in the system. As a result, twelve campuses conducted thirteen projects over the next six academic years.

Summary of Projects

Twelve of the projects shared the following basic features: they hoped to contribute to the creation of a less alien university experience for underrepresented groups and to a broader, more realistic education for all students by exposing faculty to the theory and techniques of cross-cultural education and assisting them in the revision of their courses.

The exception was a project entitled "Faculty Chicano Study Program," which was conducted at California State University, Dominguez Hills, during the 1981-82 academic year. Its underlying educational philosophy was similar to that of the other projects, but it focused specifically on the needs of Hispanic students and did not include a curricular reform component. This project sought to provide seven faculty in a variety of departments with intensive training in Spanish using materials from the Foreign Service Institute's Spanish Program. In addition, it provided the faculty participants with a systematic exposure to Hispanic culture through the use of guest lecturers, group seminars, and films.

The immediate goal was to provide these faculty with a level of cultural sensitivity and language skills which would permit them to function effectively as advisors and mentors to Hispanic students. The more long-range goal was a reduced sense of alienation among those Hispanic students who came into contact with these faculty and the gradual spread of an appreciation for the need for cultural sensitivity among other faculty who heard about and discussed the project with the seven participants. There was no expectation by the project director that the project would generate dramatic results within the project year or even shortly thereafter.

The remaining twelve projects were also designed to achieve both long- and short-term results. These projects were nearly identical; they differed only slightly in terms of design, and their educational philosophies, methodologies, and goals were all derived from a single model project.

This project, "Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum," directed by Professor Deborah Rosenfelt, was conducted in 1981-82 at San Francisco State University.[3] The project was the result of an earlier commitment

made by the university to broaden the cultural content of its curriculum. During the prior year, approximately 150 faculty had voluntarily submitted their course syllabi to be used in a survey to determine the amount of cross-cultural material in the curriculum. Those who conducted the survey concluded that there was ". . . a general lack of cross-cultural consciousness on the part of faculty," and that in most syllabi "cross-cultural materials and perspectives were minimal or absent." The reason for this, they assumed, was that most campus faculty had received their degrees before the scholarship on ethnicity in their fields was routinely taught in graduate schools.

They also concluded that ethno- and andro-centrism were self-perpetuating and that the ethnic and women's studies departments which had been created in the prior two decades still remained ghettoized on campus. The activities of these departments and the ethnic and women's courses in some disciplines did not adequately address the issue of cross-cultural education for the general student population.

It seemed to those on the San Francisco campus who were concerned about this curricular deficiency that the solution depended upon the education of the faculty. Therefore, the "Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum" project selected about ten volunteer faculty from each of six academic departments in the schools of Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences. Each of the participating faculty indicated a preliminary willingness to introduce cross-cultural materials into their courses, and each taught either General Education courses or introductory courses to the discipline, or both. In either case, the object was to introduce these materials into high enrollment courses and thereby expose the largest possible number of students to cross-cultural issues.

A total of sixty-seven faculty, each of whom received a modest honorarium, participated in the project. A workshop was conducted before the start of the spring semester for the members from each department. These six disciplinary workshops focused on consciousness-raising, cross-cultural communications in the classroom, and on the

The object was to introduce these materials into high enrollment courses and thereby expose the largest possible number of students to cross-cultural issues.

cross-cultural issues and materials relevant to each discipline; they were conducted by the project director with the cooperation of faculty from ethnic studies departments and off-campus specialists. Each participant

was then expected to revise the syllabus for a course that he/she was going to teach during the following semester so as to include approximately two weeks of cross-cultural materials. In addition, during that spring semester, two additional multi-disciplinary workshops were conducted for all participants, and others on campus who wished to attend, to further increase their sensitivity to cross-cultural issues and to assist them in the process of course revision. And finally, Professor Rosenfelt compiled a project manual for distribution to other campuses.

It was the right project at the right time. It addressed an important issue in higher education in a fashion which seemed both reasonable and feasible. On the basis of this and a fundamentally positive report by an external evaluator, API provided the project with a second year of funding for an addtional series of workshops and, beginning in 1983-84, began to use the San Francisco project as a model for replication on other campuses. To generate interest in the replication effort, API also conducted a Dissemination Conference on that campus in February 1983 for representatives from other institutions in the CSU. As a result, eleven CSU campuses were awarded funding for Inter-Campus Cross-Cultural Perspectives projects during that and the following four academic years.

These replication projects were in essence identical to the San Francisco project, but in some cases adopted different emphases or approaches. All shared the objective of sensitizing the faculty to cross-cultural issues and assisting them in introducing multicultural perspectives in their courses. The project directed by Professor Alex Yamato at Humboldt State University condensed the workshops into a single day and placed greater emphasis on generating cooperation between the faculty of the Ethnic Studies Program and the rest of the faculty. The project at California State University, Fullerton, directed by Professor Sandra Sutphen, added gender issues to the ethnic students component and included student feedback in the faculty workshops. Still others, at CSU San Bernardino, CSU Dominguez Hills, and CSU Hayward, focused on integrating multicultural materials instead of tacking them on to lectures and reading lists. These projects worked with faculty to alter the fundamental direction and structure of their courses so as to provide a balanced view of the subject.

In the years during and following API funding, Gale Auletta, Barbara Paige-Pointer, and other coordinators of the Hayward project, "Toward a Cross-Cultural Curriculum," compiled a number of resource manuals and a media catalog. The resource manuals (written for anthropology, education, English, philosophy, political science, sociology, speech communication, and theatre arts) offer faculty annotated bibliographies,

sample syllabi, and other materials to help them incorporate multicultural materials in the courses they teach. Also, the project team wrote *Towards Multicultural Literacy,* a guide to help faculty and students in any discipline become better informed about the multiple cultures of the United States. Other projects, e.g., those at San Bernardino and Fullerton, also produced annotated bibliographies on multicultural education.

Several projects explored the dynamics of student-teacher interaction as a part of their activities: The Sonoma State University faculty learned interpersonal skills appropriate to the teaching and advising of minority and foreign students. At San Jose State University, Project Director Allison Heisch developed and provided faculty with a training module, a series of exercises designed to engage the students in cross-cultural perspectives to a degree not possible in texts or in lectures.

The CSU Northridge project focused its activities on the evaluation of the concept of culture as an explanation for human behavior or a foundation for curricular change. Several important curricular revisions were introduced as a result. A secondary but significant product of the project, whose director, Professor Liucija Baskauskas, recognized the need for cross-cultural materials, was an improved index (and ultimately a new catalog) for the Film Loan Intercampus Consortium.

The project at CSU Chico focused on faculty in the Department of Education, assisting them in integrating cross-cultural perspectives into the elementary and secondary teacher credential programs. A spinoff of this very successful project, funded for a second year, was a November 1985 "Conference on Effective Teacher Preparation for a Multicultural California" sponsored by API and chaired by Professor Carol Mukhopadhyay, co-director of the Chico project.

Each CSU campus sent three to five participants who formed cross-campus groups together with colleagues from elementary and secondary education in California. The conference organizers articulated five basic assumptions, all of which were an integral part of the underlying philosophy of the twelve API cross-cultural perspectives projects:

1. effective teaching in a multicultural setting is possible;
2. teacher education programs can be designed which will produce effective teachers for multicultural settings;
3. multicultural education is for and benefits all students;
4. cultural diversity is a positive resource; and
5. effective teacher preparation for a multicultural California is a CSU and campuswide responsibility that falls solely on the schools of education.

At the conference, participants received a copy of a multicultural resource guide produced by Hernandez and Mukhopadhyay entitled *"Integrating Multicultural Perspectives Into Teacher Education: A Curriculum Resource Guide."*

The conference also generated a set of competencies for prospective teachers in order for them to be effective in a multicultural classroom and made several recommendations to the CSU campuses regarding cross-cultural education. One of these was the suggestion that campuses review the cross-cultural content of their liberal studies programs. This recommendation resulted in the final cross-cultural replication project, directed by Professor Sheila McCoy at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Evaluation

Information on the success and impact of these thirteen projects is found in the project directors' reports, the reports of the external evaluators, and a 1987 study conducted by API of the impact and persistence of all projects funded between 1980 and 1986, including the thirteen multicultural projects.[4]

Project Results

The projects played an important role in furthering an awareness among the CSU faculty of multicultural issues and the benefits to be obtained by incorporating these issues into their course material. For the most part, the projects were welcomed by the faculty on the various campuses. (Faculty opposition is discussed below.) None of the projects experienced any difficulty in recruiting the number of faculty to participate in the workshops which had been anticipated in the project proposals, nor was there any significant problem with the participation rate through the course of the projects. In all, at least 450 faculty participated in the department level workshops and perhaps another 900 participated in the colloquia.

Their response to both activities, as indicated by their comments on questionnaires distributed by the project directors, was very positive. Exactly how much consciousness-raising occurred as a result of these projects is impossible to determine exactly. But the ease with which the project directors recruited faculty and the high level of enthusiasm for the project activities among the participants indicate that the faculty appreciated both the design and intent of the workshops and colloquia. These projects obviously addressed, in an appropriate fashion, an issue which many faculty in the CSU had come to accept as important to the quality of higher education.

This appreciation for the projects resulted in genuine curricular change. The Theatre Arts faculty on the Hayward campus proceeded as a group to review and revise the department curriculum. Professor Elliott Barkan's project at San Bernardino paved the way for the recently introduced universitywide upper division requirement in multicultural/gender education and even resulted in change in campus personnel policy. As a result of Professor Rosenfelt's project, the Humanities Department added a new track for majors which focuses on cross-cultural studies. Similarly, the project at Chico conducted by Professors Mukhopadhyay and

Hernandez resulted in significant change in the elementary and secondary education curricula on that campus. In addition, approximately 60 percent of the faculty who participated in the department workshops proceeded within the following academic year to alter their course syllabi so as to include more multicultural materials. This amount of actual curricular revision is impressive, given the significant amount of work such an effort requires and the heavy commitments to instruction, research, and governance routinely made by CSU faculty. Literally thousands of students in the CSU have benefited as a result.

Approximately 60 percent of the faculty who participated in the department workshops proceeded within the following academic year to alter their course syllabi so as to include more multicultural materials.

In 1990, the directors of the CSU Hayward project, Professors Auletta and Paige-Pointer, commented on the ongoing faculty involvement in multicultural issues:

> In the process of moving from silence to discourse, our project faculty have moved into an emerging network of support. This network has facilitated the exchange of information between faculty who are working on both multicultural and gender issues. Two years after the official end of the [API] grant, many more faculty members across campus and across disciplines are involved in interdisciplinary dialogues, and perhaps as important, many more faculty members know whom to call when they have questions pertinent to gender or to cultural diversity in teaching. Because faculty members from across campus were invited to project seminars, this network extends beyond the School of Arts, Letters and Social Science and into the School of Education, the School of Science, and the School of Business and Economics.
>
> The Center for the Study of Intercultural Relations (CSIR), an extension of this network, was chartered in 1985 to serve as a link for faculty concerned with multicultural issues in higher education. The Center sponsors colloquia speakers and curriculum development programs which have played an important role in sustaining a public discourse on multicultural issues on the Hayward campus.[5]

As the above shows, all of these projects did make some significant gains. It is important to note that the success of these projects was facilitated by two important factors. The faculty participants were

recruited from disciplines which by their very nature are more inclined to be sensitive to questions of cultural differences. As one project director put it, the faculty participants were "the already convinced." This by itself would go far to explain the ease with which faculty were recruited, their high participation rate, and their "overwhelmingly positive" response. This conclusion is reinforced by the experience of the one project which did try to include faculty from disciplines outside the humanities and social sciences: Very few such faculty were interested.

The other factor which served to reinforce the overall effectiveness of at least some projects was the existence of a variety of campus-sponsored educational equity programs. Several of the project directors suggested that these programs complemented their project activities in terms of creating a favorable climate of opinion on campus for the introduction of multicultural issues into the curriculum. Seen in this light, these thirteen projects were just one part of a broader effort within the CSU to recruit and retain underrepresented groups and to create an environment on the campuses conducive to the academic success of these groups.

Design and Implementation Problems

Despite the amount of curricular change which resulted from these projects, the frustration most commonly expressed by the project directors was that the course revisions made by the faculty were too often "tacked-on" additions rather than the serious integration of multicultural perspectives into the course material. Although such additions may be a manageable first step toward re-thinking a course, the projects did not always succeed completely in translating heightened faculty awareness into meaningful, substantive revisions of the purpose and content of their courses.

There were a number of reasons for this. Most important and most obvious is that faculty are busy, and those participating in these projects — with the exception of the second-year project at San Francisco State University — did not receive release time from teaching to attend the workshops and revise their courses. In any given term, most faculty will have several projects of various types making demands on their time and energy in addition to their regular teaching load. In light of this reality, curricular revision which would genuinely integrate multicultural perspectives into courses was in some cases simply given a lower priority and consequently did not occur, at least not within a short period after participation in the project.

But there was another important factor — one inherent in the design of the projects — which affected the extent of curricular reform which

resulted from these projects: One of the most common reactions among those faculty who attended the workshops was that too much time was spent on consciousness-raising and educational theory, and not enough on practical assistance in course revision.

This was the only significant weakness in the multicultural projects. If it is fair to say that they addressed the right issue at the right time, it is also true that they generally lacked a strong application or implementation component. API's very successful Writing in the Disciplines projects, which were contemporary with the multicultural projects, provide a useful contrast. They, too, addressed a problem — student writing skills — which was widely recognized among the CSU faculty. But the writing workshops not only sensitized faculty to the nature and causes of the problem, but also placed great emphasis on providing the participating faculty with practical advice on how to deal with the problem in their particular courses, i.e., what kind of writing assignments are effective, how to grade them, etc.

Too much time was spent on consciousness-raising and educational theory, and not enough on practical assistance in course revision.

Also, in most writing workshops, the faculty spent some time drafting new writing assignments, reviewing them with colleagues, and practicing evaluation and response techniques. This practical, active component, as those associated with the writing projects realized, was crucial to the success of their efforts. Although in at least one case, San Bernardino, the project did indeed result in revised syllabi from all participants, on balance the practical component was probably too weak in the multicultural projects. As a participant in the Pomona project indicated, "Eventually we must move from consciousness-raising into practical models for curricular change." Undoubtedly, the amount of course revision and its quality would have been greater had practical training been a stronger component in the project activities. Such training would significantly reduce the amount of time curricular revision would require — a major consideration for faculty, however great is their awareness of the issue.

Professor Rosenfelt, the director of the first cross-cultural perspectives project recognized that consciousness-raising itself, aside from being unmeasurable, was also unlikely to generate immediate and dramatic results. According to her, though the immediate gains from the project were significant, its real impact would be long term. The project was "just a beginning" and its long-range value would be "its unquantifiable, intangible, impact over time." Later project directors made a deliberate

effort to include more practical training, but this gap between the idea of a particular form of curricular revision and its implementation remained a fundamental weakness in the project designs.

Most of the projects encountered one other problem which, though it did not have a direct bearing on their success, nonetheless was an element in the overall ability of these projects to affect the climate on campus in favor of greater cultural sensitivity and the integration of multicultural materials into the curriculum. The projects experienced opposition from a small, but often quite vocal, number of faculty who either heard about the project but did not participate or who attended the open, multi-disciplinary workshops or colloquia.

Some of these faculty interpreted the projects as exercises in academic politics. In particular, in the earlier projects they saw the participation of members of ethnic studies departments as an attempt to spread a narrower, rather than a broader and more tolerant, set of cultural attitudes and as a attempt on the part of those departments to enhance their prestige and influence on campus. Some saw this as a threat — an exercise which would foster ethnic ethnocentrism rather than multicultural education. It was also true that in a few cases faculty from ethnic studies departments felt themselves threatened by the prospect that their curriculum might be absorbed by other departments.

In a few cases faculty from ethnic studies departments felt themselves threatened by the prospect that their curriculum might be absorbed by other departments.

For some, this predisposition to be suspicious about the motives of those involved in the projects was confirmed by what they believed to be the unnecessarily aggressive and threatening consciousness-raising techniques used during the workshops. In one case, according to the project director, several faculty left the multi-disciplinary workshop "protesting vociferously" about what they believed to be an unprofessional and irrational approach to the problem. Other project directors reported similar responses from faculty who described the consciousness-raising techniques as "soft-headed." In the case of one project, the strength of this type of response at the first multi-disciplinary colloquia was so great that it irreparably damaged the reputation of the project on the campus and reduced the effectiveness of the department workshops.

This was an inherent danger in the multicultural workshops. The suspicion of faculty who might not wish to participate in the relative reduction of the prominence of Western thought in the curriculum — an

issue still very much alive in higher education — was a significant enough problem to test all of the diplomatic skills of any project director. But when the project began by informing, in a rather aggressive fashion, a group of faculty who regard themselves as professionals that they have participated in and fostered, and perhaps even have helped to create, a curriculum that is ethno- and andro-centric and that they may harbor racial biases themselves, then the project director ran the great risk of generating the type of reaction described above.

It took skill to minimize the possibility of antagonizing participants. Over time, the project directors learned from the mistakes of others and restructured their activities accordingly. In some cases they made certain that the workshops were conducted by persons from more than one ethnic group so as to minimize the chance that those attending would

The ability of the project leadership to anticipate and disarm this potential was a major factor in the relative success of each of these projects.

interpret the content as propaganda for one culture. Others re-ordered the workshops so that the more confrontational sensitizing techniques were conducted at the end rather than the start of the project. Initial faculty impressions were very important to the ultimate success of the project. Professor Sheila McCoy, the director of the Pomona project, was very careful to advertise the workshops as intellectual opportunities, not as vehicles "for doing penance for past White and male scholarship." This high potential for campus divisiveness made the projects inherently difficult to administer; the ability of the project leadership to anticipate and disarm this potential was a major factor in the relative success of each of these projects.

Conclusions/ Observations

Those associated with the multicultural projects would agree that it is not possible to measure the success of their projects with any high degree of precision. Faculty evaluations of the workshops and the number of revised syllabi at the end of the project were indicators of success, but consciousness-raising does not lend itself to easy measurement even in long-term projects, and these short-term projects did not incorporate post-project, long-term evaluation studies.

It is worth noting, however, that in October 1989, the CSU Hayward Center for the Study of Intercultural Relations sponsored a national conference, "From the Eurocentric University to the Multicultural University: The Faculty's Challenge for the 21st Century." This conference brought together and established a network of faculty who are working on multicultural theory, teaching strategies, and course content. Partially as the result of this conference, Professor Auletta is co-editing a publication with Terry Jones in a special edition of *The American Behavioral Scientist* entitled "The Inclusive University: Multicultural Perspectives in Higher Education."

Most of the projects, however, did not continue beyond the end of API funding, and therefore no further data on the impact of any project has been collected since the project year. Still, there is enough evidence to make several observations, some of which have a relevance beyond these projects:

1. *This form of curricular change is particularly slow.* Curricular reform never occurs rapidly, even under the best of circumstances; it is always a slow, arduous process. But these multicultural projects and their consciousness-raising techniques posed a special problem. They challenged faculty at three levels: their training, their professionalism, and their personal values. Stated very simplistically, most faculty assume they were taught the "truth" and that they now teach it. They also, as professionals, prefer to decide the content of their courses for themselves, and they are not inclined, as educated and rational professionals, to view themselves as ethnocentric or in any other way biased in their approach to their discipline.

The very existence of these projects was a threat to this self-image. Thus, the projects were successful, at least in terms of participation, among those faculty already disposed to recognize the existence of a problem and already inclined to be willing to address it. The existence by 1980 of a significant number of such CSU faculty in the social sciences and humanities made these projects feasible. But their success, at least their immediate success, was limited to the volunteer faculty. Others were either unready for, offended by, or suspicious of this particular form of curricular change.

Thus, while the projects were well received by those who participated, their immediate impact on the campuses as a whole was slight: Frustrated project directors recognized that however successful they were in raising faculty sensitivity to multicultural issues, the real impact of their projects would be long term.

2. *Strong yet sensitive leadership was crucial to project success.* The process of curricular reform is never self-sustaining; it always requires active leadership. This, again, is a generalization which can be applied to any type of curricular change. But the inherent potential in these projects for alienating faculty rather than recruiting them made politically astute and strong leadership particularly important.

3. *Genuine administrative support was equally important.* The project directors identified this as the most important ingredient in project success, and it seems clear that it was present in the case of the most effective multicultural projects. Verbal support was not enough.

Skilled administrators have the ability to create a climate for change.

Faculty needed to know that the administration regarded the project and their participation in it as important to the academic life of the university. It is very clear in the case of one project that there was no meaningful administrative support for its activities, and their impact was minimal as a result.

Skilled administrators have the ability to create a climate for change, and if the faculty agree that a particular reform is desirable, meaningful change will generally result. Based upon the history of all API grants, including the thirteen multicultural projects, significant reform is much less likely to occur if the administrative support for it is perceived as token or nonexistent. In other words, the character of the institutional setting makes major curricular reform either possible or unrealistic.

4. *The most effective arena for curricular reform was the discipline.* To the extent that those associated with these projects made any attempt to introduce cross-cultural perspectives into the entire university curriculum, they were frustrated and generally ineffective. Faculty work within their own disciplines. This is how they were trained, and this is how most faculty define their professional horizons. Thus, the most effective form of curricular reform is that which is aimed specifically at the disciplines. If faculty can

The most effective arena for curricular reform was the discipline.

recognize the relevance and value of a particular change for their disciplines, then they are far more likely not simply to support it but also to implement it. In the case of these projects, faculty response in general was much more favorable to the departmental workshops than to the universitywide colloquia.

5. *To be truly effective, curricular reform efforts must meet the needs of the faculty.* It is a truism in higher education that significant curricular reform occurs only when there is a broadly supported agreement among faculty that a serious problem exists which requires a solution. Yet it is not enough to convince faculty that they should reconsider how they view their disciplines and how they teach their courses; they should also be given the practical tools for implementing these changes. Most faculty were trained in their disciplines and have had no formal introduction to teaching skills. In addition, there are so many routine claims on faculty time that the arduous process of integrating an entirely new perspective into their courses will be undertaken only by the most enthusiastic unless they are given useful and efficient tools for doing so. This is particularly true since the inclusion of new materials means the deletion of others, and yet faculty are constantly confronted with the problem of a rapidly increasing body of knowledge that students should know.

6. *The replication process worked well.* An important and successful project on one campus was effectively replicated on several others. The model was a simple one and its implemenation on other campuses was possible with only a relatively modest investment in time and money.

   The replication projects did make minor adjustments in the model's design. This was the natural result of learning from prior mistakes. A process meant to reduce project costs and start-up time worked essentially as intended.

7. *Those projects with the most realistic and precise goals were also the most successful.* The projects were all very similar. They did, however, vary somewhat in their activities and goals. To the extent that they sought goals that were impractical, given the available time and resources, they were less successful. The most ambitious projects and those with the most obscure goals were the least successful and were the least able to describe their results.

   The lesson might be that to attempt less is often to achieve more and that which is definable is achievable. Focused efforts yield more tangible results.

These were the major factors which worked in combination to influence the success and impact of these projects. No one, not even their most enthusiastic supporters, ever argued that the projects would result in massive curricular change. As one project director concluded, genuine multicultural education may be a full generation, perhaps two, away.

On the other hand, these projects were an important start toward the realization of that goal within the CSU. Their design was fundamentally sound and, for the most part, they were implemented as planned. Approximately 900 faculty attended campus colloquia on multicultural education, and over 450 CSU faculty participated in the workshops — and most of the latter made revisions in the multicultural content of the high enrollment courses which they teach. In addition, the many publications, conference papers and other professional activities engaged in by the project directors have resulted in the dissemination of information in multicultural education to many faculty who had not actually participated in the projects. The result has been greater awareness of multicultural issues on the campuses, real, if not massive, curricular change, and a culturally broader education for literally thousands of CSU students. The projects were, in general and within their inherent limits, an appropriate and successful response to an important challenge in higher education in the United States.

References

1. James A. Banks, *Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1981), pp. 1-34. H. Prentice Babtiste, Jr., *Multicultural Education: A Synopsis* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979), pp. 2-15.

2. Intersegmental Policy Task Force on Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83, "Expanding Educational Equity in California's Schools and Colleges" (California Postsecondary Education Commission, March, 1986), p. 31.

3. See Deborah Rosenfelt and Carol Lee Sanchez, "Integrating Cross-Cultural Perspectives in the Curriculum: Working for Change in the California State Universities," *Radical Teacher* 37: 10-13.

4. Neil Rabitoy, *Persistence and Impact: An Analysis of API Project Activity 1980-86* (CSU Office of the Chancellor, 1987).

5. Barbara Paige-Pointer and Gale Schroeder Auletta, "Restructuring the Curriculum: Barriers and Bridges," *Women's Studies Quarterly, XVII, Nos. 1 and 2,* pp. 86-94.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

The Academic Program Improvement Campus Grants Program assists faculty in developing innovative approaches to improve both teaching and student learning through pilot projects, workshops, and conferences. Since 1972, when CSU first received these funds, an estimated 150,000 students and 13,000 faculty have directly participated in one of the projects, workshops, or conferences sponsored by the program. An even greater number have benefited indirectly as the effects of instructional improvements are felt by subsequent groups of students and as faculty learn from colleagues who have adopted these changes in curricula and teaching methods.

Funds are provided for faculty assigned time, clerical and student assistance, and supplies and materials not otherwise available through normal campus and departmental support. The overwhelming majority of the projects initially supported through the API office continue with support from the campus institutional budget.

Projects are selected for funding by a competitive review process in which each campus is invited to submit proposals on a variety of important topics. Review committees consist of faculty from throughout the CSU system, with final decisions made by an Advisory Committee formed of representatives from faculty, administration, and students. Decisions on proposals are made on merit, without reference to campus of origin.

For additional information on the API program, or on any of the projects described in this brochure, the reader should contact:

Institute for Teaching and Learning
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

(213) 590-5856

BEST COPY AVAILABLE